

Appl'n. No. 09/451,090  
Response dated September 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### **I. Introduction**

Applicant thanks the examiner for continuing examination and granting an interview to discuss the present Office Action.

##### **A. Status of Claims**

- Claims 79-80, 82-90, 92-95, and 97-121 are pending.
- Claims 79, 99, 118 and 120 are independent claims.
- Claims 79, 83-84, 87-88, 90, 92-93, 95, 97-99 and 115 are currently amended.
- Claims 118-121 are new.

##### **B. Interview Summary**

Applicant appreciates and thanks the examiner for extending courtesy to the applicant and his representatives during an interview on Monday, September 13, 2004 to discuss the present Office Action. During the interview, applicant, applicant's representatives and the examiner discussed rejections based upon U.S. Patent No. 5,963,915 (issued Oct. 5, 1999) (hereinafter "the **Kirsch** reference").

Ultimately, the examiner and applicant, as well as applicant's representatives, agreed to amend the claims to modify "at least one secure cookie" to be "at least two secure cookies" throughout the claims. The examiner stated that this modification, in combination with the proposed amendment that was faxed on Sept. 2, 2004, to the examiner prior to the interview, will be sufficient to overcome the **Kirsch** reference. The examiner further stated he will update the search and response in the next Office Action.

#### **II. Claims**

##### **A. Amended Claims**

Independent Claims 79 and 99 were amended to specifically define that "at least one of said at least two secure cookies is a key cookie containing an encrypted session key, said session key capable of encrypting said value data contained in another of said at least two secure cookies."

Dependent Claims 83-84, 87-88, 90, 92-93, 95, 97-98, and 115 were amended to correct their dependencies.

Appl'n. No. 09/451,090  
Response dated September 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2004

**B. New Claims**

Independent Claims 118 and 120 have been added specifically define that "at least one of said at least two secure cookies is a seal cookie, capable of being used by said server to determine if at least one of said at least two secure cookies has been altered."

Dependent claims 119 and 121 add the additional limitation to claims 118 and 120 respectively that "at least one of said at least two secure cookies is an authentication cookie."

**C. Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e).**

**1. Independent Claims 79 and 99**

None of the cited references show "a key cookie containing an encrypted session key, said session key capable of encrypting said value data contained in another of said at least two secure cookies." Therefore, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**2. Independent Claims 118 and 120**

None of the cited references show "a seal cookie, capable of being used by said server to determine if at least one of said at least two secure cookies has been altered." Therefore, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**3. Dependent Claims**

Applicant believes that all of the independent claims are now in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. All of the dependent ultimately depend on these independent claims and hence contain all of the limitations of those base claims. Therefore, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**D. The remaining prior art reference of record do not anticipate the present application.**

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for his consideration of United States Patent No. 6,691,113 to Harrison et al., entitled "Persistent Data Storage for Client Computer Software Programs" and United States Patent No. 6,601,169 to Wallace, Jr. et al., entitled "Key -based Secure Network User States." However, neither of these references are prior art, because the priority date for the present application predates the priority dates fro both of these references. The present application has a priority date of Nov. 30, 1998, whereas the Harrison

Appl'n. No. 09/451,090  
Response dated September 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2004

patent has a priority date of Sept. 28, 2000 and the Wallace patent has a priority date of Dec. 30, 1999.

### III. Conclusion

For at least all of the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and that action is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's agent at the telephone number shown below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3212.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension for time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 50-3212.

Respectfully submitted,



David Grossman  
Registration No. 42,609

Date: September 13, 2004

George Mason University  
Office of Technology Transfer, MSN 5G5  
4400 University Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
(703) 338-6333